



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ΔΡΑΠΕΤΙΔΕΣ OF CRATINUS AND THE ELEUSINIAN TAX DECREE

BY ROLLIN H. TANNER

Our knowledge of the nature and date of the *Δραπέτιδες* has been in a very unsettled condition ever since Leo¹ showed the untenability of Bergk's arguments. There are some facts, we believe, not as yet rightly understood, which will give us material assistance in determining with some degree of certainty both the nature and the date of this comedy. In one fragment (56K),

Πανδιονίδα πόλεως βασιλεῦ
τῆς ἐριβώλακος, οἷσθ' ἦν λέγομεν,
καὶ κύνα καὶ πόλιν ἦν παίζουσιν.²

although it is variously interpreted by different scholars, all are agreed that there is a reference to Pericles as "king" of Athens.³ As this taunt would be largely without force after his death, it was most probably written before the fall of 429. This *terminus ante quem* is corroborated by the reference to Xenophon,⁴ who is probably the son of Euripides,⁵ and who also died in 429, after the time of the dramatic festivals.⁶

¹ *Rh. Mus.*, XXXIII (1878), 408–12.

² For corrected reading of this fragment see pp. 69, note, and 70.

³ Leo (409) has failed to see that this is a taunt against Pericles for the almost arbitrary power which he was wielding and says, "es musste aber, so wenig wir uns über die Anrede βασιλεῦ σατύρων bei Hermippos (*Mein.* ii. 395) wundern, in hohem Grade befremden den Perikles auf der Bühne als König der Stadt angeredet zu finden." There is nothing at all inconsistent in regarding both passages as hits against Pericles. Hermippus has simply gone a step farther than Cratinus. Leo (410) himself agrees that Meineke's supposition that Πανδιονίδα ultimately refers to Pericles is probably correct. He is undoubtedly right, however, in his belief that in reality a descendant of Pandion is one of the characters of the play, and that another fragment (49K) shows clearly that Theseus was one of the *dramatis personae*. It is the same type of political mythological travesty that we have in the *Νέμεσις*, *Διονυσολέξανδρος*, and other plays. It is not unlikely that the title is connected with both the mythological subject of the play and the political object of the poet's satire.

⁴ Fr. 53K:

φέρε νῦν σοι
ἐξ αἰθρίας καταπνοσύνην μυδὸς ἀστράψω Ξενοφώντος.

⁵ See Bergk, *R.c. Att.*, 63, and Meineke, *FCG*, II, 46.

⁶ Cf. *Thu.* ii. 79. 1, 7; *Diod. Sic.* xii. 47. 3.

The argument of Bergk (46-49), that the assailing of Lampon in three different fragments:

Fr. 57K=1M:

Λάμπωνα, τὸν οὐ βροτῶν
ψῆφος δύναται φλεγυρὰ δείπνου φίλων ἀπείργειν.

Fr. 58K=2M:

νῦν δ' αὖθις ἐρυγγάνει·
βρύκει γὰρ ἅπαν τὸ παρόν, τρίγλη δὲ κἂν μάχοιτο.

Fr. 62K=11M: ἀγερσικύβηλις,

shows that the play as a whole was directed against him, seems at first thought to be refuted by Leo (408), who assigns all three fragments to the same choral song, and thinks that Lampon has no more connection with the play than Antimachus with the *Acharnians* or Archedemus with the *Frogs*. But he goes too far. He has shown the weakness of Bergk's argument, but it by no means follows that if Lampon was the subject of an ode in the play he could not also be the main object of the poet's attack. In the *Knights*, which was directed as a whole against Cleon, we find four odes¹ which are also directed entirely against him, and two others² which contain verses referring to him. And besides, we shall find (pp. 68-70) some further evidence that Lampon was attacked in other parts of the *Δραπέτιδες*, and this surely would not be likely if he stood in the same relation to this play as Antimachus to the *Acharnians* or Archedemus to the *Frogs*.

Bergk's (51-54) belief that the play was connected with the founding of Thurii has for its support only the fact that Lampon took a prominent part in this enterprise, and a mere conjecture about the title,³ which at most can only show that certain conditions might have obtained which would have made the title *Δραπέτιδες* appropriate to the colonists of Thurii. Of course all will unhesitatingly agree with Bergk that the play must have been produced at a time when Lampon was in the public eye. But Lampon's

¹ Vss. 304 ff., 324 ff., 973 ff., 985 ff.

² Vss. 384 ff. and 398 ff.

³ Pp. 61-62, "Thurii enim cum magna frugum ubertate et omni voluptatum copia abundarent, novi quoque coloni mox deliciis et libidinibus diffuebant; quam molitiem quo gravius notaret, poeta Thuriorum incolis feminarum induit speciem."

political activity is by no means limited to the time of the founding of Thurii. He was prominent in public affairs from at least this time until after the death of Cratinus,¹ and was κωμωδούμενος even as late as the production of the *Birds*.²

There is, however, an event in the life of Lampon, whose significance for this play seems not as yet to have been noticed, and to which the fragments mentioned above (p. 66) seem to refer so directly as to leave little doubt about the connection. From the well-known and much-discussed Eleusinian tax decree,³ we learn that he took an active part in advocating a law at Athens, according to which all the Athenians and their allies were required to contribute a fixed proportion of their crops to the temple of Eleusis. The fact that he was a priest,⁴ and an exegete,⁵ makes it seem more than probable that his advocacy of this decree was prompted by a very close and important connection with the management of the affairs of the Eleusinian goddesses.⁶ The opposition which this law naturally aroused was therefore directed against Lampon, who, according to the poet's representation, with the greed which was so characteristic of the hungry priest,⁷ was thus seeking to replenish his treasury. Surely there is no event in his life to which the epithet ἀγερσικύβηλις, and the verses above quoted (p. 66), can so fittingly refer. A further reference to Lampon's activity in this matter may perhaps be seen in νῦν αὖθις, of the second passage quoted; for in this decree, which taxes the barley and the wheat,⁸ Lampon is

¹ Cf. Kirchner, *Pr. Att.*, II, 8996.

² Brought out in 414. Cf. vss. 521 and 988. See also *Ar. Nub.* 331-32 and Schol.

³ *IG*, I. Sup., 59, No. 27b.

⁴ Schol. *Ar. Av.* 521.

⁵ *Eur. fr.* 297K, l. 338.

⁶ Bergk (50) cites *Arist. Rhet.* iii. 18. 1, οὖν Περικλῆς Λάμπωνα ἐπήγετο περὶ τῆς τελετῆς τῶν τῆς σωτέρας ἱερῶν, εἰπόντος δὲ ὅτι οὐχ οἷόν τε ἀτέλεστον ἀκούειν, ἥρετο εἰ οἶδεν αὐτός, φάσκοντος δέ, "καὶ πῶς ἀτέλεστος ὢν;" to show that Lampon was not an initiate in the mysteries. But, from the very fact that Pericles asked him the question, and he said he knew, it seems more likely that he was an initiate, and that the phrase ἀτέλεστος ὢν is humorously used in a double sense. It is not improbable that the whole repartee was a joke, and that both Pericles and Lampon were initiates.

⁷ Cf. *Ar. Av.* 851-902, 959-991; *Pax.* 1043-1126.

⁸ *LL*. 4-7: ἀπάρχεσθαι τοῖν θεοῖν τοῦ καρποῦ κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δελφῶν Ἀθηναίους ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν μεδίμνων κριθῶν μὴ ἔλαττον ἢ ἑκτέα, πυρῶν δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἑκατὸν μεδίμνων μὴ ἔλαττον (ἢ) ἡμιέκτεον.

authorized to prepare another decree taxing the olive oil and to present it in the ninth prytany.¹ Undoubtedly he did so, and *νῦν αὖθις* may refer to this second decree.²

In the fragment (56K) with which we began our discussion, a very apt sarcastic allusion to Lampon has been lost through corruption in some of the MSS of the text of Pollux who quotes it. The word *ἐριβώλακος* has always been a stumbling-block to scholars, who, because of its inappropriateness to Athens,³ have been led into various misinterpretations of this passage.⁴ A brief résumé of scholarly opinion on the fragment will convince us that it is not the word which Cratinus used. The early editions of Pollux (ix.99)

¹ Ll. 59–61: *περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἐλαίου τῆς ἀπαρχῆς ξυγγράφας, Λάμπων ἐπιδειξάτω τῇ βουλῇ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐνάτης πρυτανείας, ἣ δὲ βουλή εἰς τὸν δῆμον ἐξενενκέτω ἐπάναγκες.*

² Whether a decree taxing the olive oil was ever really passed we do not know positively. The accounts of the *ἐπιστάται* Ἐλευσινίῳθεν for the year 329/8 (*IG*, 2, 5, 198, No. 834b) list only barley and wheat. But possibly, as Foucart (*BCH*, IV [1880], 246) suggests, the *ἀπαρχαί* of the oil were not paid over to Demeter and Persephone, but to Athene.

³ Cf. Thu. i. 2. 5.

⁴ Kühn, quoted by Hemsterhuis in the Lederlinus-Hemsterhuis edition (1706) of Pollux' *Onomasticon*, p. 1084, says: "videtur Poëta lusisse in eo quod tribum Pandionidem assignat ludo, qui Urbs dicitur, & calculum Regis nomine signatum habet: *ἐριβώλακα* vocat eundem propter multos calculos vel *χώρας* distinctas lineis."

Bergk (64) says: "Est autem aptissimum, Thurius propter soli ubertatem affluentiamque rerum omnium dici *ἐριβώλακα πόλιν*: Pandionides autem, qui rex urbis vocatur, aut ipse est populus Atheniensis, aut unus aliquis ex conditoribus urbis, qui Pandionidis tribus fuit. Sed haec fateor incerta: prorsus autem obscurum, quorum spectet commemoratio ludi latrunculorum." These two difficulties do not exist, if the passage is made to refer to Athens (see pp. 92–93 below).

Meineke (45) doubtfully adopts Kühn's explanation: "Unum quod non satis intelligo est Athenarum urbis epitheton *ἐριβώλαξ*, in quo reconditior latere videtur ambiguitas. . . . Lapidēs lusorios etiam *βώλους* dictos fuisse intelligitur ex Dio-geniani, *Prov.* vii. 95 . . . eo igitur fortasse referendum est illud *ἐριβώλαξ*."

Kock (*CAF*, I, 30): "*ἐριβώλακα* cur dicat Atticam neutiquam fertilem nescio."

Herwerden, *Collectanea, critica, epicritica, exegetica*, 3: "Permīrum est epitheton (*ἐριβώλακος*), quoniam et aliunde et Thucydidis testimonio Atticam *λεπτόγειν* fuisse constat. Si igitur sana est lectio, ironice ita poeta, sed frigidius, dixerit necesse est. Cogitavi de corrigendo *ἐριώλακος*, turbulentae, ut poeta comice finxerit *ἐριώλαξ* ab *ἐριώλη* ad similitudinem vocis *ἐριβώλαξ*. Si nihil dixi, mihi ignoscatur. Sumus enim critici suspicacissimi mortaliū."

Leo (410) even resorts to supplying a whole verse; "Das Beiwort *ἐριβώλαξ* ist für Athen, das *διὰ τὸ λεπτόγειν ἀσταςίαςτος* war, auffallend; nicht weniger auffallend ist es, dass einem Könige, und einem Pandioniden gegenüber die eigne Stadt durch eine dunkle Andeutung bezeichnet wird; und nun gerade durch eine Andeutung, die keiner auf Athen beziehen kann. So spricht wer als Ankömmling seine eigne Heimath, und hier eine solche deren augenblicklicher Lage er sich nicht rühmen kann, umschrei-

have *περὶ κόλακος*.¹ Salamasius adopted *ἐρικόλακος*, *ex veteri libro*, and this was the reading of the Antwerp MS of Kühn (=Bruxelensis 60).² Bentley's attempt to make this reading fit the meter by emending to *ἐρικώλακος* is properly rejected by Bergk (64), since *ἐρικῶλαξ* cannot be used in Greek for *ἐρικόλαξ*. The reading *ἐριβώλακος* seems to have been put into the text by Jungerman,³ who found it in C,⁴ the best MS of one of the four main lines of tradition.⁵ The same reading was adopted by Kühn from his Vossianus MS,¹ a copy of C.⁶ As this reading seemed to make some sense in itself, suited the meter, and had the authority of C, it was also adopted by Hemsterhuis.¹ But it is just the kind of correction which would be inserted by a scribe who did not understand his original and gives us a word absolutely unsuited to the context. Bothe's *ἐριβούλακος* is rightly rejected by Leo (410₄) as not "verständlich." The true

bend nennen will. Die Vermuthung scheint hiernach nicht zu gewagt, dass der Zufall uns auf die Frage des Pandioniden

ποδαπὰς ὑμᾶς εἶναι φάσκων,
ὃ μείρακες, οὐκ ἂν ἀμάρτοι;

die Antwort erhalten hat, die etwa folgendermassen zu ergenzen sein mag:

Πανδιονίδα, πόλεως βασιλεῦ
[τῆς Κεκροπιδῶν, ἡλθομεν ἐκ γῆς]
τῆς ἐριβώλακος—οἶσθ' ἦν λέγομεν
καὶ κύνα καὶ πῶλιν ἦν παίζουσιν,

wobei dann freilich die Unruhen nicht mehr auf Athen bezogen werden dürfen." Leo has been troubled not only by the word *ἐριβώλακος* but also by Bentley's emendation of *βασιλέως* to *βασιλεῦ*, which, considering the large number of fragments which begin in the middle of a sentence, is entirely unnecessary. All the MS tradition is for *βασιλέως* (see p. 70₁). If we regard these words as spoken by the chorus of *Δραπέτιδες* from Athens to someone else about Pericles and Athens, and restore the right word to the text in place of *ἐριβώλακος*, these difficulties disappear without resorting to emendation.

That this passage can only be interpreted as referring to Athens was clearly seen by Thomas Hyde, when he said (Hemsterhuis, *op. cit.*, 1084₁₃), "Dictus Cratini locus in Captivis subobscurus est, ubi forte illudit Athenarum urbi, emphatice aliquando dicta πόλις . . . ubi adulatoribus canibus comparantur."

¹ Hemsterhuis, *op. cit.*, 1084₁₃.

² Cf. Bethe, *Pollucis Onomasticon*, I, xii.

³ Hemsterhuis, *op. cit.*, 1085₁₅.

⁴ Lederlinus, *op. cit.*, 1₁.

⁵ Cf. Bethe, *op. cit.*, I, ix-x.

⁶ Cf. Bethe, "Die Ueberlieferung des Onomastikon des Julius Pollux, 340," *Nachrichten von der königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Hist.-phil. Klasse*, 1895.

reading, *ιεροκόλακος*, is preserved by A,¹ the best representative of another main line of tradition.² It will also fit the meter.³ Here we see at once, now that we understand better the nature of this play, that in this word, coined by Cratinus for the occasion, we have a reference to the flattering priest, Lampon, who is probably also covertly referred to in the word *κύνα*, for like the *κύων* in the game,⁴ this "shameful" priest is one of the pawns with which the political game of Pericles is being played.⁵

If we can agree with Bergk (48) in assigning fr. 315K⁶ to this play, we have another reference to Lampon which is very appropriate in a play directed against the begging priest. That the play had some connection with Eleusis might be inferred from the reference (fr. 61K) to the sacred way, and from the fact that Theseus is one of the characters (p. 65₃).

The facts given above are sufficient to establish the very close relation between our play and the Eleusinian tax decree. If this conclusion is conceded, the comedy must have been produced very soon after the passage of the law. It could not have been brought out in the same year, because the City Dionysia began before the eighth prytany, and the decree was passed in the eighth prytany, or at any rate certainly not before the seventh. For the words (l. 23) *τὸ μὲν νῦν εἶναι ὡς τάχιστα* show that there was a strong feeling that no time could be wasted if the decree were to be published and promulgated in time for it to be in force during the current year.⁷ Even if we assume that the decree was passed in the seventh

¹ First published by Bekker in his *Iulii Pollucis Onomasticon*, p. 385. Professor Bethe, the second part of whose *Pollucis Onomasticon*, it is to be greatly regretted, has not yet appeared, has very kindly sent me a collation of this passage. He says, "Die Ueberlieferung des IX. Buches Pollux beruht auf zwei Handschriften-familien FS und ABCL, vgl. die Praefatio meiner Ausgabe p. xv und xx. Nun lässt S IX, 94-107 aus, C ebenso IX, 72-129; es kommen für IX, 99 also nur in Betracht F einerseits und ABL anderseits." For the word in question he gives *ἐριβόλακος* BL, *ιεροκόλακος* A, *περὶ βόλακος* F. All four MSS have *βασιλέως* in the line before (see p. 69, note).

² Cf. Bethe, *op. cit.*, I, ix.

³ For similar examples of free resolution in this meter in comedy, cf. Ar. *Eq.* 503; Nub. 911, 916; Pax. 169. Cf. also White, *The Verse of Greek Comedy*, 108, § 271.

⁴ Cf. Pollux ix. 98.

⁵ For further interpretation of this fragment see pp. 92-93 below.

⁶ *χαλκίδα κυκλήσκουσι θεοί, ἄνδρες δὲ κύβηλιν*.

⁷ Cf. Sauppe, *Attica et Eleusinia*, 7. For the same reason Schmidt, *Jahr. kl. Ph.*, CXXXI (1885), 685, feels justified in asserting, "dasz es gerade der letzten spanne der 8n. prytanie oder den anfangen des mai angehört."

prytany, the interval is too short to allow for the engraving and erection of the stone and the general spreading of information concerning the law. The play must, therefore, have been produced in the spring following the year in which the law was passed. If, then, we can determine the date of this decree, we shall have determined also the time of the production of our play.

There has been considerable discussion concerning the date of the Eleusinian tax decree.¹ All are agreed in assigning it on grounds of the writing to the period between 446 and 403. A corroboration of the year 446 as a *terminus post quem* is to be found in the deference which the decree displays toward the Greek states which were not members of the confederacy,² and which points to a date after the failure of the Pan-Hellenic congress.³ The call for this congress was undoubtedly sent out in 448/7.⁴ The fact that this decree preceded the performance of the Δραπέτιδες, which occurred not later than the death of Pericles, restricts the period to 446–429. Furthermore, as it could hardly have been passed during the years of the Peloponnesian War,⁵ we may exclude all dates after 432.⁶

The apparently favorable attitude of the Pythia toward the Athenians, which is shown in the decree by the thrice-repeated⁷ phrase κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δελφῶν, corroborates these arguments for an early date and reduces still further the limits of our dating, in spite of the claim of Schmidt⁸ that the μαντεία referred to cannot be a response just received by the Athenians.

¹ For bibliography see Ziehen, *Leges Graeciae et Insularum*, 19.

² Ll. 32–33: ἐκείνοις δὲ μὴ ἐπιτάττοντας, κελεύοντας δὲ ἀπάρχεσθαι ἐὰν βούλωνται.

³ Cf. Duncker, *GA*, IX⁵, 126.

⁴ Busolt, *GG*, III, 1, 445₂.

⁵ Cf. Foucart, *op. cit.*, 254.

⁶ It may be, as Foucart (254), Dittenberger (*Sylloge*², 34), Busolt (474₂), and Löschcke (*Die Enneakrunosepisode bei Pausanias*, 18), believe, that in Thu. ii. 17 there is a reference to the oracle which prompted this decree, although Schmidt (695) throws some doubt upon this when he says that in this passage, "handelt es sich gar nicht um ein verbot der 'errichtung von heiligtümern,' sondern um das 'bewohnen' (οἰκεῖν) des Pelargikons." If Foucart's view is right, we have a further argument for a date prior to 432.

⁷ Ll. 5, 26, 34.

⁸ Cf. *op. cit.*, 688: "nicht nur werden in bezug auf die eleusinischen ἀπαρχαὶ die πάτρια in unserm decretum bei Isokrates (*Panegy.* 31) als παλαιὰ ἐνέργεια sondern auch die μαντεία unserer inschrift von dem gewährsmann des Suidas (u. *Elpeσιώνη*) ausdrücklich als παλαιὸς χρησμὸς bezeichnet." Schmidt is followed by Ziehen (*Leges Graecorum sacrae*, 19; *Leges Graeciae et Insularum*, 22).

For, whatever may be the reference in τὰ πάτρια,¹ he has no authority for identifying the “μαντεία unserer inschrift” with the παλαιὸς χρησμός of Suidas, and, even if the identity were established, the source of Suidas could properly use the word παλαιός, “aforetime,” of an oracle of the fifth century B.C.; for παλαιός is a relative word and need not mean “ancient” like ἀρχαῖος.² It may well be that there was an ancient χρησμός which started the custom styled τὰ πάτρια in our decree. Possibly the μαντεία was one of the reminders which, according to Isocrates (*Panegy.* 31), ταῖς ἐκλειπούσαις (πόλεσι) πολλάκις ἢ Πυθία προσέταξεν, or it may have been an utterance prompted by some special situation of Athens and furnishing a motive for the decree in question. The other arguments which Schmidt (689) gives in support of his contention that this μαντεία is an old oracle are equally faulty. He claims that, if an oracle had recently been given, it would have been quoted in the decree, and there would have been no need of the συγγραφεῖς, who prepared the document for submission to the council and the people. But surely there would have been plenty of work left for them, for, from what we know of ancient oracles, we cannot assume that the Pythia would have given all the detailed directions which we find in our decree. Nor need we be surprised by the cautious deference shown to the states outside of the league in the light of the fact that, at the time the decree was passed, the oracle was favorable to Athens and therefore hostile to her opponents. Nor can any argument be derived from the failure of the decree to repeat the phrase κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τὴν ἐγ Δελφῶν in the passage referring to the allies, for the whole tenor of the decree would lead us to understand that this appeal was intended for them as well as for the Athenians and the Greeks not in the league, even if it is not expressly so stated, and probably it is implied in κατὰ ταῦτά (l. 14), as Schmidt (697) later practically admits. Surely these are weak arguments for his statement “dasz es sich fort und fort um einen orakelspruch

¹ Schmidt's statement that Isocrates designates the πάτρια of our decree as a παλαιὰ εὐεργεσία will not be accepted by one who reads the passage in the *Panegyric* carefully. Isocrates states rather that the παλαιὰ εὐεργεσία—the “aforetime” kindness of Athens—was the reason for the sending of the ἀπαρχαί by the states, and that this sending in the course of time became τὰ πάτρια.

² Cf. Capps, *Class. Phil.*, II (1907), 25–27, 33–35.

handelt, zu dessen zeit der delische bund noch gar nicht bestand."¹ Undoubtedly Foucart (232) is right in feeling that the constant use of the definite article shows that it is a particular oracle, recently received, which is calling the Athenians to the observance of their neglected duty.² In the year 434/3 we find the oracle giving a decision adverse to Athens in regard to the founding of Thurii,³ and from this time on until the truce of 423 it is so strong a partisan of the Spartans⁴ that responses in favor of the Athenians are not to be expected during that period.⁵ The decree was accordingly certainly passed before 434, and probably several years before.

From what has already been said we can confidently assign our decree to the period 446–435. Before attempting to fix its date more precisely let us examine the arguments given by Körte and others for dates later than 435.

The latest date suggested by anyone for this decree is that of Körte,⁶ who assigns it to 418. In support of this dating he adduces (321), in the first place, some peculiarities of the writing. By comparing this inscription with two others from Eleusis⁷ of about the same date, he finds that the sign of the spiritus asper is missing eight times in our document and not at all in either of the others. These two inscriptions, however, are too short to give us trustworthy data on a matter of this kind, for they contain only seven and eight cases of spiritus asper respectively, whereas our inscription contains 55 words which either do begin or ought to begin with a rough breathing. If only ll. 4–14, or 33–46, or 48–62, of our document had been preserved, we should have had a fragment containing at least as many words requiring the rough breathing as either of the inscriptions

¹ Schmidt's (689–90) argument from the political situation is based on his dating of the decree and will be discussed later (p. 91).

² τὰ πάτρια is sufficiently marked off from τὴν μαντείαν by the repetition of the article. The omission of κατὰ with the latter is adequately explained by Ziehen (*Leges Graeciae et Insularum*, 22), who says that the words κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ τὴν μαντείαν τὴν ἐν Δελφῶν "unam potius formulam efficiunt, qua quid et antiquitus et divinitus commendatum praedicetur."

³ Diod. Sic. xii. 35.

⁴ Cf. Thu. i. 118. 3, 121, 143; iii. 92; iv. 118.

⁵ Cf. Duncker, *GA*, IX⁵, 126.

⁶ *Ath. Mitt.*, XXI (1896), 320 ff.

⁷ *IG*, I. Sup., 174, No. 225k, and *Ath. Mitt.*, XIX (1894), 163 ff.

cited by Körte and yet showing not a single case of failure to use the sign; and yet the sign is lacking eight times out of fifty-five in the whole document. Besides, of the eight words in our inscription which lack the sign for the spiritus asper, six are the article, a word which in inscriptions in general lacks the sign of the rough breathing more often than any other word in the language. In the two inscriptions quoted by Körte there is but one article of aspirated form. The Nelean inscription,¹ which he calls "ein wenig freier," certainly gives a strong argument against his dating as far as its use of aspiration is concerned, for of forty aspirated words only four have the sign, and one word² has it wrongly. A far better idea of the period to which our inscription belongs as far as the spiritus asper is concerned will be gained from the accompanying table of all the Attic decrees from 446 to 411, given in the first volume of the second edition of Dittenberger's *Sylloge*, which are long enough, well enough preserved, and of a date sufficiently well established, to be of value for our purpose. The decree under consideration (Ditt.², 20) and the Nelean inscription (Ditt.², 550) are also included. Thus we

Ditt.	IG	Aspirated Words	Without Sign	Percentage	Date	Remarks
20	I. Sup., 27 ^b	55	8	14.5		But not cut in stone until after 420/1
17	I. Sup., 27 ^a	47	7	14.9	446/5	
19	I, 31	18	4	22.2	ca. 444	
21	I, 32, and Sup., p. 63	52	16	30.8	435/3	
33*	I, 40	43	14	32.6	424	
550	I. Sup., 53 ^a	40	36	90.0	418	

* In l. 18 of this inscription the restoration of Kirchhoff is followed, as it fits the space better.

see that our document has the smallest percentage of neglect to use the spiritus asper of any of these inscriptions. These results would undoubtedly be substantially the same if we were to include all the Attic decrees given in the *Corpus*.

A further consideration mentioned by Körte (321) in support of his late date for this inscription is the fact that Ionic datives plural are found only in *a*-stems, while in one of the other Eleusinian inscriptions,³ containing no datives plural of *a*-stems, all the datives

¹ IG, I. Sup., 66, No. 53^a.

³ IG, I. Sup., 174, No. 225^k.

² ἐξίεναι in l. 9.

plural of *o*-stems end in *-οισι*. But when we examine the facts, we find that this amounts to but three occurrences of the word *οἴσι*. Körte is obliged to admit that in the other Eleusinian inscription¹ datives plural of *a*-stems do not occur and those of *o*-stems do not have the Ionic form. According to Meisterhans-Schwyzzer,² the use of *-οισι* in Attic inscriptions ceases after 444 with but three exceptions, of which the form *οἴσι* quoted by Körte is one. This exception, therefore, may not be used as a criterion for dating any other inscription. Similarly, according to the same authority,³ the dative plural of *a*-stems changes to *-αις* at about 420, with the sole exception of the Nelean inscription of 418, which conservatively keeps to the Ionic form except in one word.⁴ Our inscription is accordingly precisely like all the inscriptions from 444 to 420 in that it has all its datives plural of *o*-stems in *-οις* and all its datives plural of *a*-stems in the Ionic form.⁵

The letters of the Athenian copy of this inscription, which was undoubtedly cut at the same time and probably by the same stone-cutter, are described by Wilhelm (15) as "die schönsten Formen der ausgebildeten attischen Schrift der zweiten Hälfte des fünften Jahrhunderts." This, he thinks, favors a late dating of the document, but he is obliged to admit that similar writing appears on monuments as early as 433/2.⁶ Because of the uncertainty of such comparisons, we may consider that the writing furnishes no evidence against a dating as early as 433 or even considerably earlier.

But Körte's third and chief argument (322-23) rests on the "lächerlich geringfügigen Summen," 6 Dr. and 31 Dr., which were turned over by the *ιεροποιοί* to the *ἐπιστάται* Ἐλευσινόθεν in the

¹ *Ath. Mitt.*, XIX (1894), 163 ff.

² *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³, p. 126.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 121.

⁴ Ll. 16-17, ἀποδέκταις.

⁵ This is a strong argument against the suggestion of Wilhelm (*Jahreshefte des öst. arch. Inst.*, VI [1903], 14) that in the sixth line of the small fragment of the Athenian copy of our decree the Attic datives *χίλαις δραχμαῖς* were used instead of the Ionic *χίλαισιν δραχμαῖσι* of our inscription. The shortage of space, amounting to two letters, must be accounted for in some other way. It is much more likely that the unnecessary *ν* was omitted from *χίλαισιν* and that somewhere in the line three letters were crowded into the space of two as in ll. 42 and 54 of our decree, or possibly *χίλαισιν* was shortened to *χίλαισι* (cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzzer, *op. cit.*, p. 120).

⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 15: "Freilich findet sich verwandte Schrift bereits auf älteren Steinen wie CIA, I, 32 (*Sylloge*², 21); CIA, I, 179 (*Sylloge*², 26) aus dem Jahre 433/2 v. Chr."

years 421/0 and 420/19¹ respectively, and which "sollen der Ertrag einer Abgabe sein, die vor 20 Jahren² so feierlich eingesetzt ward, zu der alle athenischen Bürger, alle Bundesgenossen und womöglich noch andere hellenische Städte beisteuerten." He allows that these are probably the amounts left after buying the victims for sacrifice as stipulated in the decree (ll. 36–40). Assuming that the cattle could be purchased for not more than 100 Dr. each,³ the sheep and goats for not more than 20 Dr. each,⁴ and allowing amply for incidental expenses, he estimates that the ἀπαρχαί could not have exceeded 500 Dr., which would represent at current prices⁵ about 250 medimnae of grain,⁶ or the tax on 150,000 medimnae of barley. On the other hand, the grain crop of Attica, which gradually decreased from the time of the sixth century,⁷ amounted in 329/8, a poor year,⁸ to about 400,000 medimnae.⁹ In view of this fact Körte (324) considers it "ganz undenkbar" that in 421/0 at least two-thirds of the Attic grain and the entire crop of the allies and other Greek states were untaxed. In support of this contention he also finds that the ἐπιστάται Ἐλευσινόθεν "hat im Jahre 408/7 eine ἀπαρχή von 1137 Dr. 3 Obolen zu buchen,"¹⁰ that in 380 Isocrates¹¹ represented the custom as still zealously observed, and (325) that in 329/8¹² the proceeds of the tax amounted to 1,152 medimnae of barley and about 120 of wheat, from the proceeds of the sale of which, after paying for the sacrificial animals, whose number was considerably increased, and after deducting several items of expense, 657 Dr. still remained for dedicatory offerings to the goddesses.

¹ *IG*, I. Sup., 174, No. 225k.

² According to the view which he combats.

³ This is based on *IG*, II, 2, 382, No. 965b; I, 86, No. 188, l. 7; II, 2, 274, No. 814a, l. 36.

⁴ Based on Böckh, *Staatshaushaltung*³, I, 96.

⁵ According to Böckh, *op. cit.*, I, 117.

⁶ To keep the figures simple he neglects the small proportion of wheat, which would be sold at a higher price, and reckons all the grain at the price of the barley.

⁷ Beloch, *Bevölkerung der griechischen-römischen Welt*, pp. 90 f.

⁸ Köhler, *Ath. Mitt.*, VIII (1883), 167 f., 211 ff.

⁹ Foucart, *BCH*, VIII (1884), 211.

¹⁰ *Ath. Mitt.*, XIX (1894), opp. p. 192, l. 4.

¹¹ *Panegy.* 31.

¹² *IG*, II, 2, 522, No. 834b., and II, 5, 198, No. 834b.

Let us examine more closely the terminology of these three accounts. In the records of 421/0 and 420/19 we read: ἐπιστάται 'Ελευσινόθεν παρεδέξαντο (6 Dr. and 31 Dr.) παρ' ιεροποιῶν 'Ελευσῖνι ἀπὸ τοῦ σίτου τῆς ἀπαρχῆς τοῖν θεοῖν; in that of 408/7: ἐπιστάται 'Ελευσῖνι τάδε παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρότερον ἐπιστατῶν ἐν πόλει ἀπαρχή (1137 Dr. 3 Ob.); and in that of 329/8: Λόγος ἐπιστατῶν 'Ελευσινόθεν κτλ (γ 3) καὶ τοῦτο (657 Dr.) παρεδώκαμεν ιεροποιοῖς ἐγ βουλῆς εἰς ἀνάθημα τοῖν θεοῖν. Now our tax decree provides (ll. 9–10) that the ἀπαρχαί are to be delivered τοῖς ιεροποιοῖς τοῖς 'Ελευσινόθεν,¹ and that after they have made the sacrifices specified (ll. 36–40) they are to provide (ll. 40–42) ἀναθήματα from the rest of the proceeds according to the vote of the people. No mention whatever is made of the ἐπιστάται. In the light of these facts, as Kirchhoff and Ziehen,² Lipsius,³ and von Prott⁴ have seen, the natural inference from the statement in the records of 421/0 and 420/19 is that 6 Dr. and 31 Dr. are merely the nominal balances which the ιεροποιοί have to turn over to the ἐπιστάται at the end of their year of office after purchasing the sacrificial animals, paying all incidental expenses, and also buying such ἀναθήματα as have been voted by the Athenian people. We have no means of determining the amount of this last item. It may have been very large. It may have covered, to use Körte's (324) expression, "mindestens zwei Drittel des attischen Getreides und die gesamte Ernte der Bundesgenossen." But we need not assume that it did, for it is probable that the custom of sending the ἀπαρχαί had been more and more neglected during the strenuous years of the Archidamian War.⁵

¹ This title is simply the more usual equivalent of ιεροποιοί 'Ελευσῖνι, as Ditt. *Syl.*², 34, No. 20₅, has shown.

² *Rh. Mus.*, LI (1896), 222; *Leges Graecorum sacrae*, 21.

³ In Schömann, *Griechische Alterthümer*⁴, II, 389₂.

⁴ *Bu.J.*, CII (1899), 115.

⁵ Cf. Sauppe, *op. cit.*, 7: "Verisimile vero est eis temporibus, quibus opes Atheniensium bello peloponnesiaco fractae neque iam ut ultro mitterent civitates reliquas commovere neque admonitionibus vim addere poterant, piam illam consuetudinem magis, magisque neglectam esse." That it was hard to keep the allied states in line is shown by Isocrates (*Panegy.* 31): ταῖς δὲ ἐκλείπουσαις πολλάκις ἡ Πυθία προσέταξεν ἀποφέρειν τὰ μέρη τῶν καρπῶν καὶ ποιεῖν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὴν ἡμετέραν τὰ πάτρια. In 329/8, only seven cities outside of Attica are represented in the ἀπαρχαί, and as Foucart (*BCH*, VIII, 203) says, "nous verrons en effet qu'en cette année 329/8 aucune ville étrangère n'avait consacré les prémices à Eleusis et que les envois sont faits seulement par les Athéniens et leurs colons."

Even if in these years the receipts from the ἀπαρχαί were so small that after paying for the offerings there was no money left for ἀναθήματα, yet an income which, in these years of distress,¹ amounted to the tax on practically one-third of the normal grain crop of Attica surely does not imply that the “durch Orakel geheiligten Brauch” was so entirely forgotten that it could not easily and naturally increase in times of peace to the point where Isocrates forty years later could represent it as “noch eifrig geübt.” It is also not impossible that, in this year of a scarcity of grain² and general hard times, the price of both grain and cattle was higher than normal. Or it may be, as von Prott (*op. cit.*) urges, that the high prices of 329/8 are to be explained by the fact that very high prices were often paid for exceptionally fine animals for sacrifice, and if the same prices be used for 420 the grain taxed would amount to about 420,000 medimnae. Thus the very facts which Körte uses to show that the inscription must have been set up after the Peace of Nicias give us, when rightly understood, good evidence that the decree was passed before that time.

We can well imagine, as Körte (326₂) suggests, that in the years immediately preceding 408/7, in the straitened circumstances in which the Athenians were at that time because of the war, and while the regular worship of the Eleusinian goddesses was interfered with by the Spartan occupation of Decelea,³ the people had refrained from voting any ἀναθήματα. And perhaps even the special offerings had

¹ The distress of these years is well portrayed by Aristophanes in several passages in the *Peace*. Cf. vss. 62–63, 105–6, 119–21. The terrible effects of the war are dramatically portrayed by the figure of the mortar and pestle (vss. 228 ff.). Cf. also vss. 263–66.

² A pathetic comment on this situation is the eagerness of the farmers of Attica to pull out the goddess Peace, even if they have to do it all themselves. Cf. *Ar. Pax*. v. 508:

ἀγ', ὦνδρες, αὐτοὶ δὴ μόνοι λαβώμεθ' οἱ γεωργοί.

That they had not been able to cultivate the fields is well shown by vss. 551–53:

ἀκούετε λεψί· τοὺς γεωργοὺς ἀπιέναι
τὰ γεωργικὰ σκεύη λαβόντας εἰς ἀγρὸν
ὡς τάχιστα' ἀνευ δορατίου καὶ ξίφους κἀκοντίου·

and by many following verses. The sickle-maker informs us (vss. 1199–200),

ὡς πρὸ τοῦ
οὐδεὶς ἐπρίατ' ἀν δρέπανον οὐδὲ κολλύβου,

³ Xen. *Hel.* i. 4. 20; Plut. *Alc.* 34.

been omitted or curtailed. In 412/1, after draining the treasuries of Athene, the Athenians had even taken the reserve fund of 1,000 Talents,¹ which had been set aside in 431 to be used only in case of immediate peril to the city, and their financial condition was fast reaching the crisis which in 406 compelled them to melt up for coinage all the valuable objects in the antecella of the Parthenon, except one golden wreath.² It is easy to understand how in 408/7 they would even hoard the comparatively small sum of 1137 Dr. 3 Ob., which, at a time when it was impossible for the Athenians to cultivate their land and when most of the allies were in a state of revolt, it may have taken more than one year to accumulate.³ Here we have simply the record of one college of ἐπιστάται turning over this balance of 1137 Dr. 3 Ob. to their successors at the end of their four years' term of office. Surely there is no evidence here of any larger ἀπαρχαί in 408/7 than in 421/0.

Some time before 329/8, as Ziehen⁴ has shown, the ἱεροποιοὶ Ἐλευσινώθεν had been replaced by the ἱεροποιοὶ ἐγ βουλῆς and the functions of their office greatly curtailed. They now had charge only of the offerings and the purchase of the ἀναθήματα; the receiving of the ἀπαρχαί and all the financial administration of the temple is transferred to the ἐπιστάται.⁵ In the record of this year we find that the 657 Dr. turned over to the ἱεροποιοὶ ἐγ βουλῆς was the amount of the ἀπαρχαί left after deducting amounts paid for the specified sacrifices and before the purchase of the ἀναθήματα. Undoubtedly any small balance left after the purchase of the offerings

¹ Thu. viii. 15; Schol. Ar. *Lys.* 173.

² Cf. *IG*, I, 54 and 69, No. 140, and Kirchhoff, "Bemerkungen zu den Urkunden der Schatzmeister der anderen Götter, 55," *Abh. d. K. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Ber.*, 1864.

³ According to this same inscription the cash reserve of the temple had been reduced to something less than three talents. Cf. the balance of over 90 talents shown in *IG*, I, Sup., 173, No. 225g.

⁴ *Rh. Mus.*, LI (1896), 222-24.

⁵ *IG*, II, 5, 183, No. 767b, and 198, No. 834b, ll. 43-45, show that in the fourth century the four-year term of office of the ἐπιστάται began with the first year of an Olympiad. So also in the inscription of 408/7 (*Ath. Mitt.*, opp. p. 192) the new ἐπιστάται enter upon their duties at the beginning of an Olympiad. But in *IG*, I, Sup., 174, No. 225k, their four years seem to begin with the third year of an Olympiad. Evidently some change in the time of their election took place between 418 and 408. This may have been the time of the afore-mentioned change in the administration of affairs at Eleusis, for which Ziehen (*op. cit.*) is searching for a more exact date.

was again returned to the *ἐπιστάται*.¹ And this no doubt would be a "lächerlich gerinfügige Summe" comparable with the 6 Dr. and the 31 Dr. turned over to them in 421/0 and 420/19. Evidently here is no argument to show that the tax decree was not yet in force in 419/8. Even if our explanation of the inscription above considered is not accepted, the fact that in 421/0 the *ἐπιστάται* receive the small sum of 6 Dr. from the *ιεροποιοί* while in 329/8 the *ἐπιστάται* pay over the much larger sum of 657 Dr. to the *ιεροποιοί* should warn us against assuming that these two amounts have been derived in the same way.

Körte (328-29) finds that in the years 420-18 Athens was again in a position to take up Pericles' program of the unification of all the Greeks in peaceful enterprise under the leadership of Athens; for Alcibiades, by the treaty with the Argives, Mantineans, and Eleans, concluded in 420,² and the operations which followed in Achaëa,³ had placed Athens at the head of one of the most powerful coalitions which she had ever gathered about her. As this coalition was dissolved in the late summer of 418 and as Körte believes that the law was not in force in 419,⁴ he fixes upon the spring of 418 as the date of the decree. He fails to see that this argument, although explaining why Athens would have been strong enough to pass the decree, does not account for the long life of the institution which it revived. The very first payment would have been disturbed by the gathering war, and a custom which started so inauspiciously would not have been likely to have the vigor he claims for it in 408/7, 380, and 329/8. Furthermore, the year 418/7 was not an intercalary year,⁵ which, as we shall see (pp. 83-87), it would have to have been if his dating were correct.⁶

¹ Cf. Ziehen (*op. cit.*): "Freilich, es ist anzunehmen, dass auch die *ιεροποιοί* ἐν βουλῇς der 4. Jahrhunderts, die ja von den *ἐπιστάται* die nach Abzug der Kosten für Opfer etc. gebliebene Summe offenbar zum Ankauf der *ἀναθήματα* erhielten, den schliesslich übrig gebliebenen Rest wieder an die *ἐπιστάται* zurückgaben."

² Thu. v. 47; *IG*, I. Sup., 14, No. 46b.

³ Thu. v. 52.

⁴ See pp. 75-76.

⁵ Keil, *Hermes*, XXIX (1894), opp. p. 358, gives a convenient table.

⁶ He has also failed to see that his statement (330) that this intercalation "gut zu der von Aristophanes in den Wolken (615 ff.) geschilderten Kalenderwirrung gegen Ende des archidamischen Krieges passt," if taken in connection with the fact that the reformation in the calendar came before 418 (Keil, *op. cit.*, 346-47), is an argument against his dating. This fact also argues against his further suggestion (330₂) that the passage from Aristophanes may belong to the revision of the *Clouds*.

One further argument of Körte (330-31) remains to be noticed. It is based on the article in Lampon's amendment to our law (ll. 54-59) which directs that the Basileus shall inclose the Pelargicon, and that in the future no one shall erect altars, quarry stone, or remove stone or earth, without the consent of the βουλή and the δῆμος, and provides a penalty of 500 Dr. for the violation of this law. A cause, "wenn nicht der Hauptanlass," of this Körte finds in the building in 420, "ohne ersichtliche Mitwirkung des Staats," of the Asclepieum, which, on the authority of Dörpfeld,¹ was either entirely or partially in the Pelargicon, and in the opposition to the sanctuary in the following year on the part of the Kerykes.² This argument rests on two assumptions: that the Asclepieum was founded without the vote of the council and people, and that it was at least partly in the territory of the Pelargicon.³ Neither of these

¹ *Ath. Mitt.*, XX (1895), 192.

² See Körte, *op. cit.*, 313-20.

³ Even though we do not take the view of Judeich (*Topographie von Athen*, 111), which limits the Pelargicon to a small area near the west end of the Acropolis, but subscribe to the main contention of Dörpfeld and his followers, that it included a much larger stretch of land along the southern slope, it is still open to debate as to whether it covered any part of the territory of the Asclepieum. After much searching in the writings of Dörpfeld, I fail to find any place where he has given us a reason for thinking that it did. In 1889 (*Ath. Mitt.*, XIV, 65) he describes this region as "das von der Klepsydra bis zum Asklepieion reichende Pelasgikon." According to Miss Harrison (*Mythology and Monuments of Ancient Athens*, 538), Dr. Dörpfeld in 1889 held that the Pelargicon extended to and only to the Asclepieum, and she so represented it on her map (296). In 1895 in the passage cited by Körte, he seems to state dogmatically that "ein anderes Stück (der alten pelargischen Burg) war vom Asklepieion und vielleicht von anderen Heiligtümern eingenommen." In the next year, 1896, he says (*Rh. Mus.*, LI, 131), "Ein Theil der Unterburg war das zur Zeit des Thukydides ὑπὸ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν gelegene Pelargikon (ii. 17), dessen spätere Ausdehnung wir zwar kennen (es reichte vom Areopag bis zum Asklepieion), dessen ursprüngliche Grenzen wir aber nicht mit voller Sicherheit angeben können. Wahrscheinlich umfasste die Unterburg den Burghügel soweit, dass sie die Klepsydra im Nordwesten und die Asklepieionquelle im Süden einschloss. Jedenfalls lag sie am westlichen und südlichen Abhang." In 1906 in his review (*Woch. kl. Ph.*, XXIII, 205-6) of Judeich's *Topographie von Athen* he simply says, "Die ältere pelasgische Festung dagegen war meines Erachtens grösser und umfasste ausser der späteren Akropolis noch einen weiteren Teil des Westabhanges und fast den ganzen Südabhang bis einschliesslich des Asklepieion." By this time Miss Harrison (*Primitive Athens*, 35, and n. 3) has adopted this view and gives two reasons for it, "The Pelasgikon of Lucian's day only extended as far as the Asklepieion: the earlier fortification must have included what was later the Asklepieion, as it would need to protect the important well within that precinct. A protest was raised against the building of the Asklepieion after it was begun; possibly this was because of its encroachment on the Pelargikon," and for this last reason she refers to the argument of Körte which we are discussing, and which, as we have seen, rests on two unfounded assumptions. The other reason is refuted by Judeich

assumptions can be proved. Regarding the first one, as von Prott (116) says, Körte himself feels the weakness of the supposition, for the worship of Asclepius was taken into the cult of Demeter, and it is unthinkable that the cult of Asclepius was settled in the Pelargicon without the vote of the council and people. The passage from Lucian,¹ which is cited by Miller² in support of the second assumption, proves, if anything, that the Pelargicon did not include any of the territory of the Asclepieum, and Dörpfeld³ so understands it. Besides, a better reason for the regulation about the Pelargicon is found in the common custom of making provision for the inviolability of consecrated ground.⁴

Thus all the arguments which Körte has advanced for his dating fall to the ground. Nor can we accept the arguments which Ziehen⁵ gives for the year 422. He accepts Körte's (321) arguments from the orthography and use of the spiritus asper as placing the decree in the time of the Peace of Nicias, and argues that during the invasions of Archidamus into Attic territory in 431-425 the offerings must have ceased; the accounts of 422-418 show that they were being made; the truce made in the month Elaphebolion in 423 with the consequent hope of peace must have offered the occasion for the passing of the decree. He is quite right in regarding the accounts of 422-418 as evidence that the law was then in force. But, as we have seen (pp. 73-75), Körte's arguments do not hold. Undoubtedly

(*op. cit.*, 111₃) when he says, "Gegen den Einschluss der Asklepieionquelle zum P. spricht, dass sich dabei der Wassermangel, der die Anhänger Kylons zur Ergebung zwang (Thuk. i. 126, 9), kaum verstehen lässt. Dörpfeld's latest statement on this subject (*Ath. Mitt.*, XXXVI [1911], 72) leaves the extent of the Pelargicon undefined, and describes it simply as "der westliche und namentlich der südliche Burgabhang, entsprechend den Angaben des Thukydides (ii. 15)." It is greatly to be regretted that Dörpfeld's long-contemplated (*Ath. Mitt.*, XXXVI [1911], 71) "grössere Arbeit" on the Pelargicon has not yet appeared.

¹ *Pisc.* 42.

² *Am. J. Arch.*, VIII (1893), 487-88.

³ Cf. *Rh. Mus.*, LI (1896), 131, quoted on p. 81₃. The reference (*Ath. Mitt.*, XIV [1889], 65), cited by D'Ooge (*The Acropolis of Athens*, 26) in support of his statement that according to Dörpfeld "the Pelargicon would include the springs of the Clepsydra and of the sanctuary of Asclepius," does not so state. Dörpfeld speaks here of "das von der Klepsydra bis zum Asklepieion reichende Pelasgikon."

⁴ Cf. Ziehen, *Leges Graecorum sacrae*, 22. See also *Leges Graeciae et Insularum*, Nos. 34 and 87.

⁵ *Leges Graecorum sacrae*, 21-22.

the ἀπαρχαί were very small during the years 431–425; but this is no argument against a still earlier date for our decree. His further argument that the confused condition of the calendar in 423¹ must have been the cause for the intercalation of an extra month is refuted by the fact that the change of the intercalary month from Poseideon II to Hecatombaeon II, which, as we shall see (pp. 83–87), is the meaning of the lines (53–54) to which he refers, did not assist in any way to relieve the confusion. That was remedied by the omission of an intercalary month from the year 422/1,² which thus became a common year, and this is argument sufficient against placing our decree in the spring of 422; for the next year according to these lines had to be an intercalary year. Nor is the caution implied in the words (l. 31) ὅποι ἂν δοκῇ δυνατόν εἶναι any more suited to the time following the truce of 423 than to the period immediately after the thirty-year truce (see p. 90). Thus we see that there is no sufficient reason to doubt the evidence already given (pp. 71–73) for a date prior to 434. Körte (322) himself feels that the decree “ist eine grossartige religiös-politische Massregel, an sich der perikleischen wol würdig.”³

The notice to which we have just referred, μῆνα δὲ ἐμβάλλειν Ἑκατονβαιῶνα τὸν νέον ἄρχοντα, which is found in Lampon's amendment to the decree (ll. 53–54), when rightly understood, helps us to fix the date more closely still. Foucart's (242) idea that it refers to the intercalation of one or more days to allow time for the bringing in of the ἀπαρχαί cannot be the meaning of the Greek.⁴ And further, as Schmidt (691) observes, what could be the purpose of lengthening the period of already more than three months by one

¹ Cf. Ar. Nub. 615 ff.

² Cf. Keil, *Hermes*, XXIX (1894), 346–47.

³ Löschcke (19) raises the question whether the scheme is not due to the opposition of the civil and religious authorities of Eleusis and Athens. But, as we shall see (p. 88), there is no warrant for assuming any such opposition; and the general plan of our decree bears too great a resemblance to other measures of Pericles.

⁴ Cf. Lipsius, *Leip. St.*, III (1880), 209: “Aber das kann ja unmöglich in den Worten liegen, nicht um ἡμέραι ἐμβόλιμοι, sondern um einen μῆνα ἐμβόλιμος handelt es sich.” Also Sauppe, *op. cit.*, 14: “diem intercalare in mense aliquo graece dici non potest ἐμβάλλειν μῆνα, sed ἐμβάλλειν εἰς μῆνα dicendum erat.” As Sauppe and Lipsius have both shown, “auch mit der Erinnerung an die Doppeldatierungen κατ' ἀρχοντα und κατὰ θεόν ist wenig gefördert,” for the examples given are all late. Cf. Usener, *Rh. Mus.*, XXXIV (1879), 418 f.

or two days? Löschcke¹ thinks that this sentence means that an extra month is to be intercalated; but, as we have already noted (p. 83), the calendar at this time needed the omission rather than the addition of a month.²

As Keil (347i) has well proved, we must agree with Lipsius (209), against Foucart (242-43), Schmidt (681-714), Schäfer,³ and Ziehen,⁴ in interpreting this sentence to mean that in the following year, which would be an intercalary year, a Hecatombaeon II was to take the place of the usual Poseideon II.⁵ Schmidt (681) strenuously claims that this sentence has absolutely no connection with the calendar and offers the following arguments in support of his theory. First, he asserts (682) that the *δημος* had nothing to say about the establishing of the calendar for any single year, that this was the business of the hieromnemon, and that he and not the people was held directly responsible for the condition of the calendar. But he has failed to notice that in the opening verses of the very passage which he cites⁶ the *δημος* is held responsible by the Clouds for the

¹ *Op. cit.*, 2045: "Waren Kalenderzeit und natürliche Zeit in Uebereinstimmung, so konnte die Panathenäengesandtschaft die *ἀπαρχή* mitnehmen. War der Kalender aber einen Monat vorausgeleitet, so war es unmöglich die Ernte rechtzeitig für jenen Termin einzubringen . . . So lag es im allseitigen Interesse gleichzeitig mit der Einführung der *ἀπαρχή* den Kalender zu revidiren."

² Cf. Schmidt, *op. cit.*, 706.

³ *Jahr. kl. Ph.*, CXXXIII (1886), 173.

⁴ *Leges Graecorum sacrae*, 19.

⁵ The reason for this provision was not, as Lipsius (211) asserts, to postpone the Pythian festival, for that, as Schmidt (707-8) has said, would have no real connection with the main purpose of our decree. And Schmidt (690, 692-95) has shown conclusively that we must find an interpretation of every provision of Lampon's amendment which is in immediate connection with the principal motion. The close connection between the provision regarding the Pelargicon and our decree has been further emphasized by Löschcke (18-19). Cf. also Curtius, *Sitzungsberichte d. Ber. Akad.*, 1884, 502. The real reason for the provision for intercalating a month is given by Keil (*op. cit.*) when he says, "Gewiss sollte die Frist für die Einlieferung des Getreides verlängert werden (darin hat Schmidt m. E. gegen Lipsius recht); das wurde eben so erreicht, dass man statt des Posid. II den Hek. II einschob; denn da die Einlieferung zweifelsohne in Boedr. zu den Eleusinien (cf. Mommsen, *Feste d. Stadt Athen*, 205) erfolgen sollte, so wurde durch Schaltung vor dem Boedr. die Frist verlängert." Schmidt (712) and Schäfer (173-74) are troubled by the failure in the decree itself to mention a time limit for the bringing in of the *ἀπαρχαί*. But this is probably to be accounted for by the fact that it was provided for *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια*. What need of putting into the decree what was self-evident?

⁶ Cf. *Ar. Nub.* 615-26:

ἄλλα τ' εἰδὲν φησιν, ὅμᾱς δ' οὐκ ἄγειν τὰς ἡμέρας
οὐδὲν ὁρθῶς, ἀλλ' ἄνω τε καὶ κάτω κυδοιδοσῶν.

disturbed condition of the calendar. As the hieromnemon held his office under the δῆμος, it is just as reasonable to assume that it could at any time instruct him regarding any feature of his duties as to admit that it "hatte wohl darüber zu entscheiden, ob man ein neues kalendersystem . . . annehmen wolle oder nicht." Furthermore, the passage in Aristophanes does not prove that the hieromnemon had anything to do with the intercalation of the months, for, as Starkie¹ has pointed out, "the errors were not due to this cause, and would have remained, no matter when they [the intercalary months] were inserted." The real ultimate redactor of the calendar for each year is shown by our decree and others to have been the Attic δῆμος itself. And this also answers the first part of Schmidt's second argument that the hieromnemon and not the archon would have been charged with the duty of making the change in the calendar. Regarding his further statement that by no means could this duty be assigned to the "new archon" because the calendar for the new year had to be determined and published before he took office,² is not this difficulty to be explained rather by supposing that, although the calendar was fixed before he took office, yet it was the executive duty of the Archon Eponymous to carry it into practical effect? This was probably done by issuing such proclamations as were needful from time to time, just as the president of the United States, for instance, issues yearly his Thanksgiving proclamation. We know that this archon had charge of most of the newer religious festivals,³ for which he would undoubtedly issue such preliminary proclamations, and which were of course affected by any change in the calendar. Schmidt's third argument (695-97), that this change in the calendar would be "in klaffenden widerspruch" with the main portion of the decree, has already been answered by Keil.⁴

In support of his contention (697) that this interpretation is contradictory to the Greek usage of these words, Schmidt gives us a very lengthy (697-704) and untrustworthy, because *ex silentio*, argument based on what for the fifth century would be altogether

¹ The "Clouds" of Aristophanes, 330, App., on vs. 625.

² This argument is further developed in *op. cit.*, 709-11.

³ Cf. Arist. *Ath. Pol.* iii. 3, and see Schöffer, *Archontes in P.W.*, II, 580.

⁴ See p. 84₅.

too few instances. Stated more fully his argument is that according to Greek chronological terminology the intercalation of a month cannot be expressed by *μῆνα ἐμβάλλειν*, nor the intercalation of a Hecatombaeon II by *μῆνα ἐμβάλλειν Ἑκατομβαιῶνα*, but that the first would have to be expressed by *μῆνα ἐμβόλιμον ἐπεμβάλλειν*, and the second by *μῆνα ἐμβόλιμον ἐπεμβάλλειν Ἑκατομβαιῶνα δεύτερον*. Schmidt admits that there are some instances (698–99) in later times of the use of *ἐμβάλλειν* in this sense, and that the usual word *ἐπεμβάλλειν* is used (700) at times without the addition of the word *ἐμβόλιμος*. He has overlooked the facts, that the “*präcisierung*” which he (703) so strenuously demands is something which comes with usage and would not be expected to be so thoroughly established in the fifth century as in the later times from which his examples are mostly taken, and that we are dealing with an inscription cut in stone in which unnecessary words are dispensed with. This condensation is seen in other parts of our inscription, e.g., in the omission of verbs governing the infinitive clauses and of the subjects of some of the infinitives and imperatives even when different from the subjects of the preceding clause.¹ In fact, Schmidt’s argument was answered in a sentence by Keil (*op. cit.*) when he said, “Dass *μῆνα ἐμβάλλειν Ἑκατομβαιῶνα* att. nicht bedeuten könne einen *Ἑκατομβαιῶν δεύτερος* einschieben, hat Schmidt für Niemanden, der Parallelen wägt und nicht zählt, bewiesen.”² Schmidt’s (704–12) long argument that the chronological interpretation contradicts all our knowledge of the calendar is overthrown, as Keil (*op. cit.*) shows, by the fact that we now have evidence for a Gamelion II³ and an Anthesterion II.⁴

Schmidt’s (713) own explanation of these words, “einen monat aber, den Hekatombaion (oder ‘den monat Hekatombaion aber’)”

¹ Ll. 10, 13, 21, 29.

² And indeed, as he adds, “Was hat’s denn für einen Zweck Belege aus den Basilica zu häufen, wenn es sich um das Attische des 5 Jahrh. handelt?” Our inscription shows evidence of some trouble with this sentence in the mark :::: which takes the place of an effaced letter just before the word *ἐμβάλλειν*. Could it be that before the erasure the sentence ran *μῆνα δ’ ἐπεμβάλλειν*, etc.?

³ *IG*, II, 1, 425, No. 320b. In connection with this inscription Keil refers to *Δελτ. ἀρχ.* 1888. 113 to which I have not had access. See also *IG*, II, 5, 181, No. 733, 5.

⁴ *BCH*, XV (1891), 353: *Ἐπὶ Ἀρχελαίου Ἀνθεστηριῶνος ἐμβολιμου κτλ.* See *IG*, II, 5, 101, No. 385c (= *Ditt.*², 242, 1).

soll der neue archon dreingeben oder einschalten, einfügen, hinzufügen, einräumen, einlegen, einsetzen, einschieben, dh. einschub geben, verzug geben, zeit (frist, anstand, nachsicht oder indult) geben" for the bringing in of the ἀπαρχαί shows in the first place how hard he must labor to get away from the obvious meaning of ἐμβάλλειν. For his meaning he can adduce (717) but one instance,¹ in which the meaning evidently belongs to the combination χρόνον ἐμβάλλειν plus a dative. Then, by Schmidt's (742) own admission that the archon had nothing to do with the Eleusinian ἀπαρχή, we are confronted with the very difficulty which he found so damaging (pp. 84-85) to the interpretation of the provision as requiring a change in the calendar.² Schmidt's theory drives him to the extremely improbable assumption (742) that a list of delinquents among the allied states was turned over, at the time of the change in administration, by the hierophant or Basileus to the new Archon Eponymous. We have only to read this hypothesis to be ready to agree with Schäfer (175) that no such function can have belonged to the new archon. A still further objection to Schmidt's interpretation is convincingly urged by Schäfer (174), who cannot see why the decree did not establish the limit for all time instead of prescribing that this same limit be set each year by the archon, without giving him any discretion in the matter.

Schäfer (175), though believing with Schmidt that this provision has no relation to the calendar, has no explanation of the sentence to which he does not himself raise valid objections. His translation of Ἑκατονβαῖωνα τὸν νέον ἀρχοντα as "der Anfang des Hekatombaion" is not warranted by Greek usage.³ Thus Schmidt's theory that we have here the designation of a "präklusivfrist" for the bringing in of the ἀπαρχαί and all his objections to "die kalendarrische erklärung" fall to the ground. The natural interpretation of this sentence is that in the following year, the executive conduct of whose calendar was in the hands of the Archon Eponymous, a Hecatombaeon II was to be the intercalary month instead of the usual Poseideon II.

¹ Plut. *Them.* 19: χρόνον ἐμβάλλειν τῷ τειχισμῷ ἐκ τῆς διατριβῆς.

² Cf. Schäfer, *op. cit.*, 173.

³ In the example he cites from Plato, *Rep.* x. 619b, ἀρχων is not used in the absolute neuter sense, which he tries to justify for our sentence. It is not a parallel case.

If, then, the year following the passage of the decree was an intercalary year, we are limited in our choice of dates to the spring of 446, 443, 440, 438, and 435.¹ Of these dates undoubtedly 435 is to be excluded, because of the extreme improbability that the Pythia was favorable to Athens in that year.² Löschcke, however, without regard to this improbability, dates the decree in 435. Just as Körte thinks he sees the cause for the regulation about the Pelargicon in the building of the Asclepieum (p. 81), so Löschcke tries to find it in the building of the Odeum and Propylaea by Pericles and Mnesicles, which must surely have caused much disturbance for the Eleusinium.³ The interruption of this work he regards as the effect of this regulation. And then with the help of the fact that the following year was an intercalary year he reaches the date 435. But the great similarity of the main provisions of our decree with other Periclean plans,⁴ and the known intimacy of Pericles and Lampon,⁵ are arguments sufficient against any interpretation of the decree which assumes that it was in any way in opposition to the great statesman. Besides, this article, by a saving clause,⁶ makes abundant provision for exceptions to its restrictions. Pericles at this time would have had no difficulty in securing whatever author-

¹ Busolt (*GG*, III, 1, 474₂) inadvertently puts these dates each a year earlier: "Unter dieser Voraussetzung bleibt nur die Wahl zwischen Frühjahr 444, 441, 439 und 436." In the same note, he makes no objection to Lipsius' method of reckoning by which "Zwischen 446 und 430 nur das Jahr 438/7 (Ol. 85, 3) zugleich ein bürgerliches attisches Schaltjahr und ein . . . pythisches Festjahr war."

² Cf. p. 73. For the same reason, Busolt (*GG*, III, 1, 474₂) has no hesitation in excluding 436, and Duncker (*GA*, IX⁵, 126₃) feels that the decree "kann demnach nicht zu weit hinter der Wiedereinsetzung der Phokier in die Verwaltung des Heiligtumes und gewiss nicht nach 440 liegen."

³ *Op. cit.*, 18-20: "Denn sicher war es doch dieselbe Hand, die am Fuss der Burg, und die am Südfügel der Propyläen dem Werke des Mnesikles halt geboten hat, zumal im Amendement des Lampon angeordnet wird τὸν βασιλέα ὀρίσαι τὰ ἱερὰ τὰ ἐν τῷ πελαργικῷ und eine Neuterminirung der Bezirke der Artemis Brauronia, der Athene Nike, der Artemis Hekate und der Chariten augenfällig den Weiterbau des Südfügels gehemmt haben. Jene Störung fand Statt, als der Unterbau der Propyläen vollendet war, und die Werkstücke des Gebäudes selbst behauen aber noch nicht versetzt."

⁴ This fact leads Kekulé (*Die Reliefs an der Balustrade der Athene Nike*, 26) finally to decide against his own suggestion that this article was inserted in the decree to thwart the building operations of Mnesicles.

⁵ *Plut. Per.* 6; *Arist. Rhet.* ii. 18, p. 1419a, 2.

⁶ L. 56: ἀνευ τῆς βουλῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου.

ization would be necessary for his building projects. Then, too, the great uncertainty that still obtains regarding the location of the Eleusinium greatly weakens this argument. And as we have already seen (p. 82), this provision is better explained as prompted by a religious regard for sacred land.

A statement in the scholia to Aristophanes¹ enables us to exclude two of the four remaining dates, for he tells us of a law forbidding personal censure in Greek comedy, which was in force during the archonships of Morychides (440/39), Glaucinus (439/8), and Theodorus (438/7). Kaibel's objection² that *μὴ κωμῳδεῖν* means to produce no comedies at all is completely refuted by a Roman fragment of a record of Athenian comic didascaliae,³ in which we have two lines, (4) ἐπὶ Θεοδώρου Σατύρου and (13) ἐπὶ Μορυχίδου, which, though fragmentary, prove conclusively that in two of these years, 437 and 439, comedies were performed at Athens. Evidently *μὴ κωμῳδεῖν* refers to the lampooning of prominent persons.⁴ Inasmuch as the *Δραπεδίτες*, which, as we have shown (pp. 67-71), was performed in the next spring after the passing of the Eleusinian decree, with its personal censure of Lampon and Pericles, could not have been produced during the years 439-437, the years 440 and 438 are to be excluded from the list of possible dates for our decree.

This leaves us the choice between 446 and 443. And surely the apparent attitude of Athens toward the allies fits well with this early dating.⁵ A further argument against a date much later than 446, which seems to have been overlooked by later commentators, is the fact, noted by Sauppe (5), that in this inscription the earlier form of the letter Ν⁶ is retained. We cannot, however, assume

¹ *On Ach.* 67: Οὗτος ὁ ἀρχων (Euthymenes, 437/6), ἐφ' οὗ κατελύθη τὸ ψήφισμα τὸ περὶ τοῦ μὴ κωμῳδεῖν γραφὴν ἐπὶ Μορυχίδου. Ἰσχυσε δὲ ἐκείνων τε τὸν ἐνιαυτὸν καὶ δύο τοὺς ἐξῆς ἐπὶ Γλαυκίνου τε καὶ Θεοδώρου, μεθ' οὓς ἐπ' Εὐθύμηνους κατελύθη.

² *Hermes*, XXX (1895), 82.

³ *IG*, XIV, 292, No. 1097. See also Capps, *Class. Phil.*, I (1906), 219.

⁴ Bergk (142-43) regards this phrase as equivalent to *μὴ ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν*. Cf. also Leo, *Quaestiones Aristophaneae*, 11 ff.

⁵ Cf. Sauppe, 5: "Atque ut de temporibus anno 446 proximis cogitemus ea nobis persuadent, quae de sociis Athenienses decernunt: nam gubernacula societatis etiamtum validis manibus et animo obsequii certo teneri intelligimus. Itaque cum Periclis unius consiliis res publicae regi coepae essent, haec Athenis acta esse apparet."

⁶ Cf. Schütz, *Historia Alphabeti Attici*, 45 f. Also Roberts, *Intr. to Greek Epigraphy*, I, 102; II, xii. Of course Sauppe (5) was wrong in attempting to base an

with him (8) that this is sufficient argument against a date after 445.¹ The fact that of the twelve datives plural of *o*-stems, which occur in our decree,² not one has the Ionic form argues against the year 446.³ Nor does the opinion evidently displayed in the decree,⁴ that it would not be advisable to send heralds to all the states, afford any argument for the earlier date. For although, as Sauppe (5) says, it may have been due to the repulse which had been met by the ambassadors whom Pericles had sent out to all the states with the call to a Pan-Hellenic congress,⁵ it cannot be shown that this opinion was changed by the establishing of the thirty-year peace; for the attempt was never renewed. Further, to conjecture with Sauppe (9) that the failure of the heralds, who were sent out to urge all the Greek states to bring in the ἀπαρχαί, to meet with a hearty response, was a contributory cause of the willingness of Pericles to make the thirty-year peace, is to assume without any basis in knowledge that these heralds did so fail. The long life and great power of the custom here established give strong presumptive evidence that they met with a high degree of success.

A strong argument against dating our decree in the spring of 446 is to be found in the political situation of Athens at that time. In the late summer of 447 she had suffered a severe defeat at Coronea,⁶ which had opened the way for a general defection of her subjects, including all Boeotia (except Plataea), Phocis, Locris, Euboea, and finally Megara, so that the Athenian hegemony was in danger of being overthrown,⁷ and this catastrophe was soon followed by the invasion of Attica by a Peloponnesian army.⁸ Surely there could be no more inauspicious time for the launching of a project which was to claim contributions from all the allies and solicit them from

argument for an early date on the form of κ , which we find in this inscription, for we find this form more or less frequently until after 403. Cf. Roberts-Gardner, II, Nos. 10, 12, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36.

¹ The form of this letter $\mathcal{N}$ as given by Roberts-Gardner, II, No. 9, seems to have survived a little later than the $\mathcal{N}$. But cf. also the late use of $\mathcal{N}$ in *IG*, I. Sup., 13, No. 33a, for which see Roberts-Gardner, II, No. 13.

² In ll. 9, 11, 17, 25, 33, 43, 44.

³ Cf. Meisterhans-Schwyzer, *op. cit.*, 126.

⁴ L. 31: $\delta\pi\omicron\iota\ \delta\nu\ \delta\omicron\kappa\eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \delta\nu\alpha\tau\omicron\nu\ \epsilon\lambda\upsilon\alpha\iota$.

⁵ Cf. Plut. *Per.* 17.

⁶ Busolt, *GG*, III, 1, 422.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 424.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 426.

all Greece. Only after the subjugation of Euboea in 446 and at the conclusion of the thirty-year peace in 445 was Athens in position to undertake with any hope of success such a project as that outlined in our decree.¹ Undoubtedly another consequence of the defeat at Coronea, as Schmidt (690) points out, was that the Delphic oracle again came into the possession of the Delphians and was therefore hostile to the Athenians. He feels the force of this argument so strongly that he regards it as one of his most convincing proofs against the hypothesis of a recently received response. But as we (pp. 71-73) have not only overthrown Schmidt's other objections to regarding this oracle as one just received from the Pythia, but have given reasons for believing that it was a newly delivered oracle, we must the rather regard the attitude of the oracle toward Athens just after the battle of Coronea as further conclusive evidence against the year 446. It is very likely that one of the provisions of the thirty-year peace was that all should have free and undisturbed access to the Pythian oracle. In the truce of 423² and the treaty of Nicias³ we find such provision given the prominent place. Possibly, for a while at least after 445, the oracle was more favorable to Athens.

A strong argument in favor of the last possibility that remains, the year 443, is the fact, noted by Busolt,⁴ that in 445/4 Athens suffered from a grain famine,⁵ resulting from successive crop failures.⁶ This, as he says, probably caused an appeal to Delphi and led to the *μαρτεία* which figures in our decree. That, as Schmidt (684) urges, the first half of 443 was already occupied for both Lampon and Pericles with the founding of Thurii is no argument against placing the decree in the same year; for, from what we know of these statesmen, they were quite capable of handling both these projects, and some others besides, at the same time. The reasons which have led to this early dating are so strong that they far outweigh the somewhat tentative suggestions of Wilhelm (15)⁷ based upon the character of the writing. If similar letters are found on inscriptions of 433/2,

¹ Foucart (256) feels that "le moment le plus convenable pour le decret semble être les années qui suivirent la trêve de trente années," and Schmidt (684) concurs in this opinion.

² Thu. iv. 118.

³ *Ibid.*, v. 18.

⁴ *GG*, III, 1, 474₂.

⁵ Cf. Schol. Ar. *Vesp.* 718.

⁶ Cf. *IG*, I, Sup., 8, No. 22c, l. 6.

⁷ See p. 75.

it is not impossible that our monument, engraved only ten years earlier, one of the most important and probably one of the most carefully executed of all the Athenian decrees, shows a degree of perfection not found in many contemporary inscriptions.

We can now have no doubt that the decree was enacted in the spring of 443.¹ The *Δραπέτιδες* was consequently performed in the following spring, 442.² Surely there is no other place and time so well described by the "dog and city game,"³ of the fragment (56K) quoted at the beginning of this paper, as the city of Athens at about the time of the ostracism of Thucydides, son of Melesius. For, according to Meineke's (45) very keen interpretation of the fragment,

¹ This year was an important time in the history of the Athenian people, for, as we shall see, it witnessed the ostracism of Thucydides, son of Melesius, which removed the last important opposition to the power of Pericles. In this same spring important changes were made in the administration of the affairs of the Delian Confederacy. The league was divided into five provinces, and the allies became practically subjects of Athens. See Meyer, *GA*, IV, 43. Corresponding to these changes, from this year on, we find the allies grouped under subheadings in the tribute lists (*IG*, I, 119 f.). Also the name of the *Ἑλληνοταμίης* is added at the end of the list, and an extra officer, a *συγγραμματεὺς*, is assigned to this year and the next. At the same time preparations were made for the founding of Thurii (Busolt, *GG*, III, 1, 523₃. See also Vömel, *Quo anno Thurii conditi sint?*). As this colony lay in a thriving wheat district, no doubt, as Busolt (*GG*, III, 1, 527) suggests, its founding would serve "wesentlich zur Deckung des gerade damals empfindlichen Bedarfes Attikas beizutragen," and Lampon no doubt thought, as Busolt again says (*GG*, III, 1, 529), that he "eine erhebliche Steigerung der eleusinischen Getreidespenden erwarten mochte." If, as Lipsius (208) says, the completion of the temple at Eleusis is connected with this decree, we thus win a very exact dating for the erection of this temple, which must have been finished in 444 or 443.

² Meineke (*FCG*, II, 43) dates the *Δραπέτιδες* "proximo tempore ante Thurios conditos h.e. ante Olymp. LXXXIV. 1" (=444/3), in the belief that the *μελρακες* of fragment VI (=fr. 55K) are the Sybarites, but this view, like Bergk's interpretation of the title (see p. 66₃) rests on mere conjecture, and is improbable now that we know that the play had to do with the *ἀπαρχαί* of Demeter and Persephone.

³ This game seems to have been played on a sort of checkerboard, called πόλις, with men called κύβες. Cf. Pollux, *Onomasticon*, ix. 98-99: ἡ δὲ διὰ πολλῶν ψήφων παιδιὰ πλινθίων ἐστὶ χώρας ἐν γραμμαῖς ἔχον διακειμένας. καὶ τὸ μὲν πλινθίων καλεῖται πόλις, τῶν δὲ ψήφων ἐκάστη κύβων· διηρημένων δὲ εἰς δύο τῶν ψήφων κατὰ τὰς χώρας, ἡ τέχνη τῆς παιδιᾶς ἐστὶ περιλήψει τῶν δύο ψήφων ὁμοχρῶν τὴν ἑτερόχρουν ἀνερεῖν, ὅθεν καὶ Κρατίνῳ πέπαικται·

Πανδιονίδα πόλεως βασιλέως
τῆς ἱεροκόλακος, οἷσθ' ἦν λέγομεν,
καὶ κύνα καὶ πόλιν ἦν παίζουσιν.

For corrections made in the reading of the Fragment quoted, see pp. 69, note, and 70. Cratinus, through this reference to the "Son of Pandion," is evidently alluding to Pericles as "King of a priest-flattered city," the "King-piece" in the political game, and says "you know the 'city,' I mean, and the game of 'dog and city' we play at."

it refers to the struggle for the supremacy of Athens, which took place at that time between Pericles and his political opponents. The word βασιλεύς, in the first line of this fragment, is probably used in a double sense. In the game referred to it seems to have denoted a piece that was not moved except under compulsion after every other resource had been exhausted.¹ Metaphorically it implies the instability of Pericles' position. Nothing could be more natural than a threat of this kind in the mouths of his opponents just after the ostracism of Thucydides. "You have your advantage now, but the game is still on, and sooner or later the king piece must be moved." Although there has been considerable disagreement among scholars as to when this ostracism occurred, I think we need have no doubt about the correct date. Plutarch² describes Pericles as ruling with absolute power for fifteen years after the ostracism of Thucydides. Undoubtedly, from the use of the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυσίοις στρατηγίαις, Plutarch's statement is based on the fact that after the ostracism Pericles was elected στρατηγός for fifteen consecutive years. Since it is now established that he was re-elected for the year 430/29,³ these fifteen years were 443/2–429/8 inclusive. As Busolt⁴ observes, the short interval, during which he was deposed, would naturally be neglected by our biographer, who is interested in making the period as long as possible. Busolt (*op. cit.*)⁵ places the ostracism in the year 443/2, but it is evident that it must have occurred in the spring⁶ of 443, since the entire fifteen-year period

¹ It is, no doubt, this same game which is referred to in Schol. Theocr. vi. 18: μέσσην γὰρ τιθέασιν οἱ παίζοντες ψῆφον, ἥς οὐχ ἄπτονται, εἰ μὴ τέλεον ἡττώμενοι αὐτῆς ἄψαιντο. And again: ἐκείνοι γὰρ ὅταν πολλὰ ποιήσαντες οὐ δύναται ὁ ἕτερος νικῆσαι τὸν ὁμοπαίκτηρα, κινεῖ καὶ τὸν ἀπὸ γραμμῆς λίθον, ἥγουν τὸν οὕτω βασιλέα καλούμενον.

² Per. xvi. 2–3: τεσσαράκοντα μὲν ἔτη πρωτεύων ἐν Ἐφιάλταις καὶ Λεωκράταις καὶ Μυρωνίδαῖς καὶ Κίρωσι καὶ Τολμίδαῖς καὶ Θουκυδίδαῖς, μετὰ δὲ τὴν Θουκυδίδου κατάλυσιν καὶ τὸν ὀστρακισμόν οὐκ ἐλάττω τῶν πεντεκαίδεκα ἐτῶν διηνεκῆ καὶ μίαν οὖσαν ἐν ταῖς ἐνιαυσίοις στρατηγίαις ἀρχὴν καὶ δυναστείαν κτησάμενος, κτλ.

³ Cf. Swoboda, *Hermes*, XXVIII (1893), 541 ff. and Wilamowitz, *Aristoteles und Athen*, II, 248.

⁴ *GG*, III, 1, 495₃.

⁵ Followed by Kirchner (*Pr. Att.*, 7268 and 11811), Martin (*s.v.*, "Ostrakismos" in Daremberg et Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités*, IV, 260, and *Notes sur l'ostracisme dans Athènes*, 16–18), et al.

⁶ The preliminary vote, as to whether the people would have recourse to ostracism in the current year, was taken in the sixth prytany (cf. *Arist. Ath. Pol.* xliii. 5).

came μετὰ δὲ τὴν Θουκυδίδου κατάλυσιν καὶ τὸν ὀστρακισμόν, and Meyer¹ agrees with this dating. When the *Δραπέτιδες* was produced, in the spring of 442, the opponents of Pericles were still fretting over their defeat and were kindled with indignation at the many new undertakings which were being launched by their now dominant antagonist.

ILLINOIS COLLEGE

¹ *GA*, IV, 44. The same result has also been attained by Carcopino, (*Histoire de l'ostracisme athénien*, 204-10).